

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED STABILISATION OF THE GENERIC NAME
TRINCHESIA IHERING, 1879, AND SUPPRESSION UNDER THE PLENARY
 POWERS OF *DIAPHOREOLIS* IREDALE & O'DONOGHUE, 1923. Z.N.(S). 1106
 (see present volume, pages 52–55)

By David Heppell (*Dept. of Zoology, The University, Glasgow, Scotland*)

I am fully in agreement with Dr. Lemche's proposal to place the generic name *Trinchesia* Ihering, 1879, on the Official List, with type-species *Doris caerulea* Montagu, 1804, as designated by Pruvot-Fol, 1954. This name is then available for those species included in *Cratena* auctt. non Bergh. I am not so happy, however, with the proposals concerning the nominal genus *Diaphoreolis*. We are grateful to Dr. Lemche for having pointed out the probable synonymy of its only species, *northumbrica*, with *caerulea*, but this alone does not seem sufficient grounds for suppression of the generic name, as this is a question of taxonomic judgment based on the acceptance of Dr. Lemche's contention that the specimen observed alive by Alder and Hancock over a period of several days, and whose whereabouts is at present unknown was in an unhealthy condition. What should we do if, having suppressed this name as a senior subjective synonym of *Catriona* [hardly a threat to stability], we were to dredge up more specimens referable to *Diaphoreolis northumbrica* which proved, on anatomical investigation, to be distinct from *Trinchesia caerulea* and its congeners?

Thus, with the exceptions of (1) (a) and (4), I should like to support all of the proposals made by Dr. Lemche in the present application.

REPLY TO SOME COMMENTS ON Z.N.(S.) 1044 AND 1102–1107
 (see volume 21, pages 35–37; 410–415)

By Henning Lemche (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*)

With much pleasure I find that my applications seem to have found rather general approval, and I shall do my best to find suitable compromises on the remaining points.

Z.N.(S.) 1044.

The propositions of Mr. Heppell concerning this application are acceptable to me. If anybody may feel doubts as to whether Cuvier, in 1805, established a genus *Tergipes*, it is better to settle the question under the plenary powers. Also, I have no objection to the proposal of suppressing the two specific names from Risso, 1818. I simply did not feel sufficiently competent myself to take action on them. Finally, I informed the Secretary a few days ago on my inclination to switch over to accepting TERGIPEDIDAE on exactly the grounds presented now by Mr. Heppell (see above, page 9).

Z.N.(S.) 1102.

Mr. Heppell is in this case in the unfortunate position of having to base his judgment on the confused situation of today, without knowing the results on which I base my proposals. May I try to explain briefly the crucial points. In the last twenty years I have collected thousands and thousands of opisthobranchs alive, and since 1955/56 I have paid special attention to the difficult genus *Eubranchius*. Now I can recognize eight species—including *farrani*—with their dorsal appendages (cerata) placed in simple, separate, transverse or oblique rows, and one species—with a very aberrant spawn—with the cerata densely set and in clusters. This species is *Eubranchius tricolor* = *Egalvina viridula*. The oldest generic name for the genus here in question is *Amphorina* Quatrefages, 1844, but I do not agree with Mr. Heppell in his plea for a recovery of that name. As explained in my application, *Amphorina* stands for one of the worst confusions that ever appeared in nudibranch taxonomy and it has almost never been used in the correct sense but consistently over a long period for species of *Cuthona* and "*Cratena*" (auctt. non Bergh). I still maintain that it is better to sup-

press that name altogether. The next available name seems to be *Capellinia* Trinchese, 1874, an almost forgotten name revived under new misunderstandings by Pruvot-Fol (1954—Faune France 58 : 420). She refers the species *exiguus* Alder & Hancock to *Capellinia* and all other species with separate rows to the "true" *Eubbranchus*. The figures given by Trinchese (1877—Aeolid. fam. Aff. tav. 24 *Tergipes doriae*, and tav. 25 *T. capellinii*) do not confirm this relationship. From the figure, *T. capellinii* is indistinguishable from the specimens of *cingulatus* Ald. & Hanc. collected by me, and neither the number, the shape, nor the arrangement, of the cerata agree with *exiguus*.

The present situation at the generic level was well illustrated already by Thiele (1931—Handb. Moll. k. 1 : 452). He mentions *Egalvina* (type: *viridula*) with densely set cerata, and *Eubbranchus* (type: *tricolor*) as having distinctly separate rows. This situation is the one generally accepted and therefore also the one I wish to stabilize as closely as possible, but the name *tricolor* is making trouble, as it, too, stands for the single species with cerata in clusters. That the name *tricolor* stands for complete confusion is illustrated once more by Mr. Heppell (who should not be blamed, however, as he only explains the confusion that he himself has been taught). Hence, I very much favour a solution where the highly ambiguous name *tricolor* is replaced by the unambiguous and generally known name *viridula* Bergh.

Z.N.(S.) 1105.

In the period between the first presentations of these proposals in 1956 and now, the name *Cratena* seems to have been established in such a manner that further confusion does not appear likely, and there is no gain any more in suppressing it. Consequently, I accept the proposals from Mr. Heppell and Dr. Burns to preserve it.

The family name, however, makes trouble. Evidently Bergh's CRATENINAE in 1892 (: 1021) containing a.o. "*Cratena*" and "*Hervia*" (both misinterpreted) is given for the CUTHONIDAE and not for the group containing the genus *Rizzolia*. As, in Carus (1889 : 209), Bergh mentions the sole genus "*Hervia*" under the sub-family CRATENINAE, there is no doubt that this family name cannot be transferred to its correct position except under the plenary powers. However, I am in some doubt whether it is appropriate to introduce that name on the Official List. It will be of use if it proves to cover a taxon different from the FAVORININAE to which Bergh referred the genus *Rizzolia*. Maybe, we had better drop that family name problem for the time being, which is therefore now my proposal.

Z.N.(S.) 1106.

Apparently, Dr. Burns agrees with me in the whole of this application, and I am glad to have his additional remarks. Mr. Heppell raises a single point, namely that of *Diaphoreolis*. Two points of view may be applied in such cases. The one is what to do if nothing ever arises. Shall we then accept in the meantime *Diaphoreolis* as a senior synonym to *Catriona*. Such a solution does not appeal to me, and I prefer the suppression of *Diaphoreolis* for the sake of stability. The other view is to ask what to do if really such a separate genus proved to exist. The answer is simple: Describe it again. It is possible even to suppress the names for both the purposes of priority and homonymy and, if so, even the same name can be used again—though with a new author and date (which would seem reasonable as the original authors have done nothing of real value in this case). If Mr. Heppell would like to make such a proposal, I should not protest.

FURTHER COMMENTS BY MR. HEPELL

Z.N.(S.) 1102.

Dr. Lemche's reply is valuable for shedding further light on the existing state of confusion about the genus *Eubbranchus*. Now that he has so clearly pointed out the distinguishing criteria of the two groups involved, has shown that *tricolor* (= *viridula*) is a species quite distinct from the others, and that the other species of "*Eubbranchus*" auctt. are referable to *Capellinia*, I see no reason why *Eubbranchus* (in the restricted sense) and *tricolor* should not be placed on the appropriate Official Lists. I am,